



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

frequency of the use and its range. It is found with no fewer than sixteen different verbs of a considerable variety of meanings in Cicero alone, to say nothing of its far from infrequent use in Sallust, Caesar, Livy, and other writers.

In dealing with textual problems Müller naturally exhibits the same conservatism as characterizes his own textual labors, and is inclined to support MS tradition as against the acceptance of conjectures. Thus in Caesar *B. G.* ii. 35, he holds to *xv dies supplicatio decreta est* (where editors write *in dies* or *dierum*), citing in support Cato *Agr.* 112. 2, *in sole ponito biduum*; 162. 3, *suspendito in vento biduum*; as well as Livy xxvii. 4. 15, *supplicatio diem indicta*, where again *in* has been gratuitously inserted by editors.

Despite the wealth of material presented in Müller's volume, there are topics where fuller illustration is desirable. One misses citations of passages showing two accusatives with *transduco*, particularly as bearing on the text in Caesar *B. G.* ii. 10. 1, *funditores pontem traducit*, where Meusel, followed by many recent editors, reads *ponte*. Similarly under *celo*, and particularly in the case of verbs of making, calling, regarding, and the like with two accusatives. But omissions of this sort are rare and relatively trivial. The value and importance of the work will be at once apparent to all who desire to learn the ultimate facts of usage from an authoritative source, and will assure its title to be regarded, as Skutsch in his Preface himself denominates it, "ein dauernder Besitz unserer Wissenschaft."

CHARLES E. BENNETT

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

C. Suetoni Tranquilli opera. Vol. I: De vita Caesarum libri viii. Recensuit MAXIMILIANUS IHM. Editio minor. Leipzig: Teubner, 1908. Pp. 359. M. 2.40.

The first volume of Ihm's new recension of Suetonius, which was published by Teubner in 1907, is now added to the "Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana," with such omissions as the scope of this series rendered necessary. The text is naturally the same as that of the *editio maior*, and the critical apparatus, which in accordance with the usage in the more recent volumes of this series is at the foot of the page, although considerably reduced, contains all of the most important variant readings. The *testimonia*, however, are omitted, as well as the illustrations. The Preface gives the history of the text and the relations of the MSS, together with the lists of editions and special works dealing with the author, but considerations of space have compelled the omission of the valuable list of *mendorum genera*, which is found in the larger edition.

Considering that fifty years have elapsed since the appearance of Roth's edition, the number of variations from his text which have resulted from Ihm's long and careful study of Suetonius is surprisingly small. These are in general in the direction of a return to the manuscript readings, even when these are manifestly corrupt, as well as unintelligible. The function of a critical text should be to give us the text of a writer according to the best evidence, but everyone will await with interest Ihm's commentary, in which the interpretation of moot points will be discussed.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Untersuchungen zu Lucilius. Von CONRAD CICHORIUS. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1908. Pp. 364. M. 12.

This study of Lucilius from the point of view of a professor of history is an interesting and important addition to the recent edition of Marx. The author speaks in the highest terms of Marx's commentary, although he differs from his conclusions in not a few particulars. The uncertainty which must always attend the reconstruction of a writer whose works are preserved only in the form of citations is vividly shown by a comparison of the interpretation of certain passages by L. Müller, Marx, and Cichorius. The brilliant and ingenious combinations from which information as to the details of the life of Lucilius is derived by all these scholars more frequently arouse our admiration than convince us.

Cichorius rightly emphasizes the value of Lucilius as an historical source, since he furnishes the only contemporary document, with the exception of a few fragments of the orators, for the period from the middle of the Numantine war until near the close of the struggle with the Cimbri and Teutones, and we cannot but wish that the interpretation of the fragments were less doubtful.

In the chapter on the life of Lucilius the stemma of the poet's family is reconstructed from his father M. Lucilius to Pompey the Great, but unfortunately it all rests on the unproven assumption that the Manius Lucilius of the *Senatus consultum* of Adramyttium (*Ephem. Epigr.* IV. 213) is the poet's brother. Both Marx and Cichorius agree that Lucilius never married, basing this opinion on the uncomplimentary reference to women in the fragments and the indications of various liaisons; but one cannot but think of the case of Euripides. As to the date of Lucilius' birth, Cichorius rejects the ingenious theory of Haupt, which has been accepted by Marx and others, and with considerable probability assigns it to 167, assuming a transposition of X and L in Hieronymus. Cichorius also disagrees with Marx in regarding Lucilius as a Roman citizen and a member of the equestrian order. Both agree in making him the posses-